# School Accountability Report Card Reported Using Data from the 2010-11 School Year Published During 2011-12 

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.
- For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.


## I. Data and Access

## EdData Partnership Web Site

EdData is a partnership of the CDE, EdSource, and the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) that provides extensive financial, demographic, and performance information about California's public kindergarten through grade twelve school districts and schools.

## DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest webpage at http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/ that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners.

## Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible. Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

## II. About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2011-12)

| School |  | District |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| School Name | Rancho San Joaquin Middle School | District Name | Irvine Unified School District |
| Street | 4861 Michelson Drive | Phone Number | (949) 936-5000 |
| City, State, Zip | Irvine, CA 92612 | Web Site | www.iusd.org |
| Phone Number | (949) 936-6500 | Superintendent | Dr. Terry Walker |
| Principal | Scott Bowman | E-mail Address | twalker@iusd.org |
| E-mail Address | sbowman@iusd.org | CDS Code | $30-73650-6071179$ |

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2010-11)
This section provides information about the school, its programs and its goals.

Rancho San Joaquin is proud of being named a California Distinguished School twice and a National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. This honor is reflective of our commitment to creating an educational environment that helps all children achieve success.

The school built a foundation for teaching and learning by focusing on analytical thinking, performance assessment, ethical values, and work habits. Our talented and dedicated staff is committed to helping students learn to use their minds well and to be life long learners. Through the positive behavior system (PBIS) Rancho R.U.L.E.S. implemented at Rancho, our students will be good citizens who are caring and ethical individuals in this ever-changing diverse world.

Rancho San Joaquin School - located in the village of University Park - had 873 7th and 8th students enrolled in the 2010-2011 school-year. Although English speaking students make up the majority of the student population, the student body includes a variety of ethnic backgrounds and languages and the school hosts the district's English Language Learner Program.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2010-11)
This section provides information on how parents can become involved in school activities, including contact information pertaining to organized opportunities for parent involvement.

The parents and community play a crucial part of the programs and success of Rancho Middle School. The parents provide support through numerous activities such as; volunteering in the office, chaperoning dances, participating in field trips, and helping supervise other activities.

The formal avenues for parents to demonstrate their support is through our PTA and School Site Council where their feedback and creative ideas help shape the instructional programs.

Our community has become a contributing member of Rancho through their kind donations for our Rancho R.U.L.E.S. (Positive Behavior Program) as they have helped provide rewards for students that are recognized for their appropriate behaviors.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2010-11)

| Grade Level | Number of Students |
| :--- | :---: |
| Grade 6 | 1 |
| Grade 7 | 400 |
| Grade 8 | 442 |
| Total Enrollment | 844 |

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2010-11)

| Group | Percent of <br> Total Enrollment | Group | Percent of <br> Total Enrollment |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Black or African American | 1.2 | White | 31.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.5 | Two or More Races | 1.7 |
| Asian | 53.2 | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 10.2 |
| Filipino | 1.8 | English Learners | 17.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4.9 | Students with Disabilities | 5.6 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.1 |  |  |

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

| Subject | 2008-09 |  |  |  | 2009-10 |  |  |  | 2010-11 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Avg. Class Size | Number of Classrooms |  |  | Avg. Class Size | Number of Classrooms |  |  | Avg. Class Size | Number of Classrooms |  |  |
|  |  | 1-22 | 23-32 | 33+ |  | 1-22 | 23-32 | 33+ |  | 1-22 | 23-32 | 33+ |
| English | 20.5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 1 | 14 | 10 | 16.8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Mathematics | 34.9 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 33.5 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 32.5 | 1 | 9 | 12 |
| Science | 35.3 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 33.4 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 34.6 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Social Science | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 1 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Number of classes indicates how many classrooms fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom). At the secondary school level, this information is reported by subject area rather than grade level.


## III. School Climate

## School Safety Plan (School Year 2010-11)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan, including the dates on which the safety plan was last reviewed, updated, and discussed with faculty; as well as a brief description of the key elements of the plan.

Rancho San Joaquin Middle School is committed to creating an orderly, physically safe, and emotionally secure learning environment for every student. Our school safety mission is to help students develop sound judgment and ethical behavior, while promoting student self-esteem through positive work habits and attitudes.
The Safe School Plan for Rancho San Joaquin Middle School is evaluated yearly and amended, as needed by the school site council or school safety planning committee. Key elements of the plan include: 1. procedures for maintaining a safe and orderly environment; 2. student behavior data; 3. school crime data; 4. intervention programs; 5. school rules and discipline policies; 6. suspension and expulsion policies; 7. discrimination and harassment policies; 8. hate crime policies; 9. child abuse reporting procedures; 10. Ingress and egress procedures; and 11. A disaster response plan. Rancho continues to train its staff in CPR/First Aid, disaster preparedness, and search and rescue techniques.

Suspensions and Expulsions

| Rate | School |  |  | District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ |
| Suspensions | 0 | 4.52 | 4.98 | 2.84 | 3.52 | 2.95 |
| Expulsions | 0.92 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.22 |

* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment (and multiplying by 100).


## IV. School Facilities

## School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2011-12)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Description of the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of the school facility
- Description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements
- The year and month in which the data were collected
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair


## Year and month in which data were collected:

The school, originally built in 1971, was modernized in 2001 and is surrounded by attractive grounds and landscaping. There are 32 classrooms, including four computer labs and two modules or portables. In addition to boys and girls locker rooms, students have access to a weight room and cardio lab. Other facilities include a moderately sized library with computer access, a multipurpose room, an outdoor quad, and extensive field and court space. All of these facilities are kept in good repair and our custodial staff and district support personnel take great pride in maintaining an attractive, clear, and safe school. The tennis and basketball courts were resurfaced in 2005, and the outside play equip was replaced in 2010.

## School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2011-12)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Determination of repair status for systems listed
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair
- The Overall Rating (bottom row)

| System Inspected | Repair Status |  |  |  | Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exemplary | Good | Fair | Poor |  |
| Systems: <br> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer | [ X ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |
| Interior: <br> Interior Surfaces | [ $\times$ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |
| Cleanliness: <br> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation | [ X ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |
| Electrical: Electrical | [ X ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |
| Restrooms/Fountains: <br> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains | [ X ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |
| Safety: <br> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials | [ X ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |  |


| System Inspected | Repair Status |  |  |  | Repair Needed and <br> Action Taken or Planned |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exemplary | Good | Fair | Poor | [ ] |  |
| Structural: <br> Structural Damage, Roofs | $[\mathrm{X}]$ | [] | [] | $[\mathrm{l}$ |  |  |
| External: <br> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ <br> Doors/Gates/Fences | $[\mathrm{X}]$ | [] | [] | [] |  |  |
| Overall Rating | $[\mathrm{X}]$ | [] | [] | [] | As of the most recently completed school <br> site inspection, the facility condition is <br> considered to be exemplary. |  |

## V. Teachers

## Teacher Credentials

| Teachers | School |  |  | District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ |
| With Full Credential | 32 | 57 | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6}$ | 1015 |
| Without Full Credential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

| Indicator | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total Teacher Misassignments | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Vacant Teacher Positions | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.
** "Vacant Teacher Positions" refer to positions not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester.

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2010-11)
The Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires that core academic subjects be taught by Highly Qualified Teachers, defined as having at least a bachelor's degree, an appropriate California teaching credential, and demonstrated core academic subject area competence. For more information, see the CDE Improving Teacher and Principal Quality webpage at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/

| Location of Classes | Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Taught by |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | NCLB Compliant Teachers | Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers |
| This School | 98.84 | 1.16 |
| All Schools in District | 99.06 | 0.94 |
| High-Poverty Schools in District | 0 | 0 |
| Low-Poverty Schools in District | 99.03 | 0.97 |

[^0]
## VI. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2010-11)

| Title | Number of FTE <br> Assigned to School | Average Number of Students per <br> Academic Counselor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Counselor | 2 | 425 |
| Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development) | 0 | --- |
| Library Media Teacher (Librarian) | 1 | --- |
| Library Media Services Staff (paraprofessional) | 0 | --- |
| Psychologist | .5 | --- |
| Social Worker | 0 | --- |
| Nurse | .2 | --- |
| Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist | .4 | --- |
| Resource Specialist (non-teaching) | .5 | --- |
| Other | 0 | --- |

* One Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full-time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full-time.


## VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2011-12)
This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Year and month in which data were collected: September, 2011

| Core Curriculum Area | Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ <br> Year of Adoption | From <br> Most Recent <br> Adoption? | Percent of Students <br> Lacking Own <br> Assigned Copy |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading/Language Arts | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. All textbooks purchased are <br> state-adopted, and are standards aligned. | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| Mathematics | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. All textbooks purchased are <br> state-adopted, and are standards aligned. | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| Science | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. All textbooks purchased are <br> state-adopted, and are standards aligned. | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| History-Social Science | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. All textbooks purchased are <br> state-adopted, and are standards aligned. | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| Foreign Language | N/A | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| Health | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. All textbooks purchased are <br> state-adopted, and are standards aligned. | Yes | $0 \%$ |
| Visual and Performing Arts | All students are provided an individual textbook or <br> instructional material. | Yes | $0 \%$ |

## VIII. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2009-10)

| Level | Total <br> Expenditures <br> Per Pupil | Expenditures <br> Per Pupil <br> (Supplemental/ <br> Restricted) | Expenditures <br> Per Pupil <br> (Basic/ <br> Unrestricted) | Average <br> Teacher <br> Salary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Site | $\$ 4,453$ | $\$ 187$ | $\$ 4,266$ | $\$ 74,925$ |
| District | --- | -- | $\$ 4,345$ | $\$ 72,136$ |
| Percent Difference: School Site and District | --- | -- | $-1.83 \%$ | $3.87 \%$ |
| State | --- | --- | $\$ 5,455$ | $\$ 69,207$ |
| Percent Difference: School Site and State | --- | $-21.81 \%$ | $8.26 \%$ |  |

* Supplemental/Restricted expenditures come from money whose use is controlled by law or by a donor. Money that is designated for specific purposes by the district or governing board is not considered restricted.
** Basic/Unrestricted expenditures are from money whose use, except for general guidelines, is not controlled by law or by a donor.
For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the CDE Current Expense of Education \& Per-pupil Spending webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec/. For information on teacher salaries for all districts in California, see the CDE Certificated Salaries \& Benefits webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/. To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data Web site at: http://www.ed-data.org.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2010-11)
This section provides specific information about the types of programs and services available at the school that support and assists students. For example, this narrative may include information about supplemental educational services related to the school's federal Program Improvement (PI) status.

For 2010-11, Rancho San Joaquin Middle School received special funds in the amount of $\$ 64,332$. The majority of these funds were spent on personnel, materials and supplies to serve the unique educational needs in the following programs
\$34,092 - Economic Impact Aid /English Language Acquisition Program
\$30,240 - School Improvement

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2009-10)

| Category | District <br> Amount | State Average for <br> Districts In Same Category |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning Teacher Salary | $\$ 39,922$ | $\$ 42,017$ |
| Mid-Range Teacher Salary | $\$ 71,298$ | $\$ 67,294$ |
| Highest Teacher Salary | $\$ 92,163$ | $\$ 86,776$ |
| Average Principal Salary (Elementary) | $\$ 109,913$ | $\$ 108,534$ |
| Average Principal Salary (Middle) | $\$ 114,353$ | $\$ 112,893$ |
| Average Principal Salary (High) | $\$ 128,780$ | $\$ 123,331$ |
| Superintendent Salary | $\$ 227,784$ | $\$ 226,417$ |
| Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries \& Benefits webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.


## IX. Student Performance

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including:

- California Standards Tests (CSTs), which include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and nine through eleven.
- California Modified Assessment (CMA), an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards in ELA for grades three through eleven; mathematics for grades three through seven, Algebra I, and Geometry; and science in grades five and eight, and Life Science in grade ten. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations.
- California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA), includes ELA and mathematics in grades two through eleven, and science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations.

The assessments under the STAR Program show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. On each of these assessments, student scores are reported as performance levels.

For detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, see the CDE STAR Results Web site at http://star.cde.ca.gov.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison

| Subject | School |  |  | District |  |  | State |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
| English-Language Arts | 84 | 86 | 83 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 49 | 52 | 54 |
| Mathematics | 86 | 85 | 83 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 46 | 48 | 50 |
| Science | 86 | 90 | 90 | 84 | 86 | 88 | 50 | 54 | 57 |
| History-Social Science | 80 | 82 | 81 | 71 | 74 | 76 | 41 | 44 | 48 |

* Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group - Most Recent Year

| Group | Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EnglishLanguage Arts | Mathematics | Science | History-Social Science |
| All Students in the LEA | 82 | 79 | 88 | 76 |
| All Student at the School | 83 | 83 | 90 | 81 |
| Male | 80 | 84 | 91 | 83 |
| Female | 87 | 82 | 89 | 79 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 86 | 91 | 92 | 86 |
| Filipino | 81 | 81 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 58 | 44 | 81 | 71 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 84 | 77 | 92 | 78 |
| Two or More Races | 83 | 79 | 78 | 75 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 57 | 55 | 73 | 58 |
| English Learners | 21 | 52 | 47 | 14 |
| Students with Disabilities | 56 | 37 | 83 | 59 |
| Students Receiving Migrant Education Services |  |  |  |  |

* Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.


## California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2010-11)

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the fitness standards for the most recent testing period. For detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state, see the CDE PFT webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/.

| Grade <br> Level | Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Four of Six Standards | Five of Six Standards | Six of Six Standards |
| 7 | 12.7 | 22.4 | 58 |

* Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.


## X. Accountability

## Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of state academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000 , with a statewide target of 800 . For detailed information about the API, see the CDE API webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/.

## Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools' API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state.

The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of 1 means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of 10 means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

| API Rank | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Similar Schools | 9 | 9 | 9 |

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group - Three-Year Comparison

| Group | Actual API Change |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | 2 |
| All Students at the School | 18 |  | -1 |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |  |  |
| Asian | 16 | -1 | 10 |
| Filipino |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino |  |  |  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 21 |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |

* "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. " $C$ " means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group - 2011 Growth API Comparison
This table displays, by student group, the number of students included in the API and the 2011 Growth API at the school, LEA, and state level.

| Group |  | 2011 Growth API |  |  |  | State |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | School |  | LEA |  | Growth API |  |  |
|  |  | Growth API | \# of Students | Growth API | \# of Students | Gren |  |
| All Students at the School | 778 | 953 | 20,192 | 921 | $4,683,676$ | 778 |  |
| Black or African American | 10 |  | 438 | 809 | 317,856 | 696 |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 |  | 111 | 869 | 33,774 | 733 |  |
| Asian | 405 | 997 | 8,594 | 962 | 398,869 | 898 |  |
| Filipino | 15 | 960 | 582 | 920 | 123,245 | 859 |  |
| Hispanic or Latino | 39 | 823 | 1,785 | 822 | $2,406,749$ | 729 |  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 1 |  | 77 | 853 | 26,953 | 764 |  |
| White | 246 | 916 | 7,160 | 907 | $1,258,831$ | 845 |  |
| Two or More Races | 13 | 803 | 419 | 915 | 76,766 | 836 |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 77 | 798 | 2,213 | 815 | $2,731,843$ | 726 |  |
| English Learners | 102 | 860 | 3,621 | 880 | $1,521,844$ | 707 |  |
| Students with Disabilities | 51 | 742 | 1,964 | 761 | 521,815 | 595 |  |

## Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal ESEA requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found at the CDE Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) webpage at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2010-11)

| AYP Criteria | School | District |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Made AYP Overall | Yes | No |
| Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts | Yes | Yes |
| Met Participation Rate: Mathematics | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts | Yes | No |
| Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics | Yes | No |
| Met API Criteria | Yes | Yes |
| Met Graduation Rate (if applicable) | N/A | Yes |

## Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2011-12)

Schools and districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. For detailed information about PI identification, see the CDE PI Status Determinations webpage: http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp.

| Indicator | School | District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Program Improvement Status |  | Not In PI |
| First Year of Program Improvement |  |  |
| Year in Program Improvement |  |  |
| Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement | --- | 1 |
| Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement | -- | 3 |

## XI. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

## Professional Development

This section provides information on the number of days provided for professional development and continuous professional growth in the most recent three year period. Questions that may be answered include:

- What are the primary/major areas of focus for staff development and specifically how were they selected? For example, were student achievement data used to determined the need for professional development in reading instruction?
- What are the methods by which professional development is delivered (e.g., after school workshops, conference attendance, individual mentoring, etc.)?
- How are teachers supported during implementation (e.g., through in-class coaching, teacher-principal meetings, student performance data reporting, etc.)?

Professional development is targeted at our Continuous School Improvement goals of increasing the percentage of students who score at the proficient level or higher on the California Standards Test in English/Language Arts, Science and Mathematics. Specific areas of focus include the development of successful intervention strategies to assist low achieving students, the alignment of curriculum with content standards, the development of anchor assessments for writing,, math and science and increased departmental and cross curricular collaboration.

Over the past three years Rancho has utilized regularly scheduled late start days to provide staff members time to collaborate within departments, meet as an entire staff and provide individual teacher time to help improve the instructional program. During the 20102011 school-year Rancho developed a professional development calendar utilizing a 9:30 late start on each Wednesday. This allowed for 12 school-wide meetings, 10 department meetings, 9 individual teacher sessions, and 7 professional development days.

The major focus during the 2010-2011 school year was on the continued development of an Intervention Pathway that is consistently implemented for any struggling student. Teachers and other faculty members have been involved in Faculty Intervention Team (F.I.T.) meetings to plan and share successful startegies that work for these students. The emphasis is to provide numerous interventions before formal assesments need to be implemented. The Rancho staff strongly believes in "Doing What Is Best For Kids."


[^0]:    * High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

